

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandria Vignus 22313-1450 www.upic.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/745,414	04/05/2001	Carlos Pedrido	Q62474	9890
73	590 07/16/2003			
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 800 Washington, DC 20037-3213			EXAMINER	
			HOFFMANN, JOHN M	
			ARTUNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1731 DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/745,414	PEDRIDO ET AL.			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	John Hoffmann	1731			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 03 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearamentation (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice  I) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of	•				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleaned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) $oxed{\boxtimes}$ they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);			
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
<ul><li>(c) \( \sum \) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	· · · <del></del> _				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed: 1-9					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: 10 and 11.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. $\square$ The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	proved by the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 2	<u>(XX</u> . 1			
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>		John Hoffmann 7-15-03			
		Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1731			

Continuation of 2. NOTE: THe new issue is whether the change from "through" to "within" would make the claims allowable...

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the amendment was not entered and the arguments regarding claim 10 were not convincing. The reference indicates that other arrangements are "clearly" possible. This indicates that one of ordinary skill would "clearly" know of other arrangments. The clearest mode of introducing "inert and/or process gas into furnace B" is to have something that feeds directly into furnace B. Nicholson discloses that 25 is a representation of just one of the possibilities. Furthermore, this pipe would be for introducing gas into "C" or into 'C and B'. This does not cover the case where the means just introduces gas into B - which Nicholson explicitly provides for by indicating B "or" C (see the "and/or" of col. 8, line 64). The most clear way would be the equivalent structure of 25: a pipe that feeds directly to B. As to the argument that the invention is for drawing a fiber - such is an intended use limitation and imparts substantially no structural limitations onto the claim. There is no indication as to why Nicholson's arrangment can't be used to draw fibers.

Continuation of 10. Other: The information disclosure statement filed 3 July 2003 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.97(d) because it lacks a statement as specified in 37 CFR 1.97(e).